



**TOWN OF WESTFORD  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

TOWN HALL  
55 Main Street  
WESTFORD, MA 01886  
Telephone (978) 692-5524 Fax (978) 399-2558

**Planning Board Meeting Minutes**

**April 6, 2015**

**Approved November 2, 2015**

**Place:** Town Hall, Meeting Room 201, 55 Main Street, Westford, MA

**Present:** Michael Green, Dennis Galvin, Kate Hollister, Matthew Lewin, Darrin Wizst

**Staff Present:** Chris Kluchman, AICP; Jeff Morrissette, Town Planner; Paul Starratt, PE;  
Jonathan Silverstein, Town Counsel

Green opened the meeting.

**Open Forum:** 7:30 p.m.

Starratt stated the Agricultural Commission was given money for a community garden. The Engineering Department is assisting with this project and asked if the Board would like the plans to come before them. The Board indicated the information Starratt provided would be sufficient.

**Non-Public Hearing Items:** 7:32 p.m.

Stony Brook 2 Covenants: Morrissette stated these covenants are to ensure that certain work is done prior to issuance of occupancy permits, and have been reviewed by Town Counsel.

*Motion made by Galvin to approve the covenants for Stony Brook Phase 2 relative to roadway and related infrastructure. Motion seconded by Wizst. The motion passed by a 4-0-0 vote.*

Plan Endorsement, PB 1430 SPR SPMCP SWM, 5 Lyberty Way: *Motion made by Galvin to approve the Site Plan for 5-7 Lyberty Way, Westford, MA, as prepared by LandTech Consultants, dated March 31, 2015. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 4-0-0 vote.*

*Hollister arrived at the meeting at 7:36 p.m.*

Plan Endorsement, PB 1429 SPCD SWM SCE, 28 Old Lowell Road: *Motion made by Galvin to approve Site Plan for a common driveway at 28 Old Lowell Road as shown on site plan Common Driveway by LandTech Consultants dated April 2, 2015. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

*Approved November 2, 2015*

Request for Administrative Approval, 10 Lyberty Way: Scott Verrier from Puma was present. Morrisette stated they are requesting to install a small soccer field in the front of their property. In order to do this they will have to redirect a driveway and move some parking spaces.

*Motion made by Galvin to approve administrative review for proposed athletic/recreation field plan submitted by Puma North America, located at 10 Lyberty Way, as submitted to the Westford Planning Board on March 3, 2015, and with comments made this evening. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

### Public Hearings:

#### **PB 1515 PRE, 94 Chamberlain Road**

7:36 p.m.
-----------

*Douglas C. Deschenes on behalf of Lauren Baker Revocable Trust. Public hearing for review of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan to create a two lot subdivision in accordance with Section 218-10 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. The subject property is located at 94 Chamberlain Road and is identified as Assessor's Map 033 Parcel 0037 Lot 0000 and lies within the Residence A Zoning District.*

*Motion made by Galvin to waive the reading of the public hearing notice. Motion seconded by Hollister. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

*Motion made by Galvin to open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

Douglas Deschenes, representing the applicant, addressed the Board. Present with him was the applicant, Lauren Baker, and Matt Waterman from LandTech Consultants, Inc. He stated 94 Chamberlain Road is approximately 2.89 acres and has 316 feet of frontage. They would like to create two lots, but would need frontage for the second lot. In order to accomplish this they can create a street off of Chamberlain Road, but would prefer to build a single driveway and leave the land for the street untouched. He requested the Board waive construction of the street.

Morrisette stated that creating the paper street pushes the development closer to the wetland. Starratt pointed out that creating the paper street would create frontage for lot 96R. Morrisette reminded the Board they do have the ability to preclude additional development.

John Amato, 88 Chamberlain Road – He asked if the road could become a roadway for a larger development if someone were to build on additional lots. Deschenes stated if someone were to purchase additional parcels and combine them with these parcels they could build a larger subdivision, however, since they are proposing a private way this eliminates the possibility. Morrisette stated they can make conditions to prevent that from happening. Mr. Amato asked if this development will have to follow best practices, as there is a substantial wetland. Starratt stated they would have to comply with stormwater management regulations. Mr. Amato stated he would prefer the smaller roadway, and expressed concern that whatever is constructed not create runoff onto his property.

It was agreed that the applicant had enough guidance to come back to the Board with a definitive plan.

*Motion made by Galvin to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

*Motion made by Galvin to approve with modifications the Preliminary Subdivision for 94 Chamberlain Road, plan received March 6, 2015, with the provisions discussed tonight related to waiver of construction and location of home within the lot, and protection from further expansion of the subdivision roadway. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

**Executive Session:** 8:10 p.m.

Green announced the Board will be entering executive session.

*Motion made by Hollister to enter executive session to discuss strategy with respect to litigation, related to Newport Materials, LLC vs. Planning Board, as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining or litigation position of the Town, and to invite staff and Town Counsel. Motion seconded by Galvin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 roll call vote.*

Green reopened the public session.

**PB 1504 SPR/MCP/SP WRPOD/SP Under 9.3/SWM  
20 Commerce Way (Also Known as 540 Groton Road)  
Newport Materials LLC and 540 Groton Road LLC  
Continued from March 16, 2015**

8:45 p.m.

*Public hearing for a Site Plan Review (Section 9.4 of the Zoning Bylaw), a Special Permit for a Major Commercial Project (Table of Principal Use Regulations and Section 9.3A), a Special Permit for storage of hazardous materials within the Water Resources Protection Overlay District, Section 8.1) a Special Permit (Section 9.3), and a Stormwater Management Permit (under Chapter 147 of the Town of Westford General Bylaws) in order to construct an asphalt manufacturing facility and associated materials stockpile yard with a 10,000 gallon tank for storage of #2 fuel oil. The applicant seeks the above permits and any other permit or relief as may be required under the Town of Westford Zoning Bylaw and as may be required by the Decision issued by Land Court 10 MISC 429867. The subject property is identified as Assessor's Map 048 Parcel 0011 Lot 0234 and is within the Industrial A Zoning District.*

Green explained the logistics of the meeting and overflow meeting space.

Kluchman reviewed the materials which are before the Board. She stated the Board will be hearing from Jonathan Silverstein, Town Counsel. Also present are the town's traffic and sound consultants who are available for questions. She stated the Zoning Board of Appeals has decided to reopen the hearings on two variances and one special permit, which will be heard in early May.

Green stated he did review the video from the March 16 meeting and the appropriate Mullin form has been executed, so he can participate in this hearing.

Jonathan Silverstein, Town Counsel, stated that the parties submitted a joint motion to extend the deadline for the Board to act on remand to April 24, and the court has allowed that motion. He

stated that a recent correspondence from Attorney Deschenes referenced documents which may not have been part of the Board's current or original record.

Douglas Deschenes addressed the Board. Present with him was Rick DeFelice of Newport Materials. He agreed to review the list and verify any documents that were not part of the original public hearing and revise the list accordingly. Kluchman stated town staff has not cross checked the list and will not be doing so as it is up to the applicant to ensure that the Board has the appropriate information it needs to close the public hearing. Lewin advised the applicant if there are documents that have to be reviewed by the Board they will have to receive them before Friday, preferably by tomorrow, in electronic form.

James Barnes, Acentech, Inc., peer reviewer working for the town, addressed the Board. He stated since the last meeting he was provided an updated model that was provided by the applicant's consultant. They had requested that the applicant include the rock crusher within this model, however, they declined to this this. He stated the model shows the applicant should be able to comply with a 53 dBA criteria at the west property line. He stated if the applicant can provide the attenuation, along with additional effort at the sources, they should be able to meet what they are claiming to be able to meet.

Galvin asked if Barnes is satisfied that the applicant will be able to comply with the judge's limitations of 70 dBA and 53 dBA. Barnes stated yes, given a receptor height behind the wall. Galvin asked if the rock crusher is a significant omission, and would this information alter his assessment. Barnes stated that with the rock crusher overall levels would be greater. Galvin asked the applicant why the rock crusher information was not disclosed when it bears directly on the decision the Board has to make with regard to whether this satisfies the criteria established by Judge Sands.

Deschenes stated the rock crusher is an existing piece of equipment that is on the site legally and operating pursuant to other permits, and is not part of the asphalt plant. He stated he is unsure if the existing rock crusher was included in the ambient sound when the study was conducted.

Barnes stated that 43 dBA ambient would not include the rock crusher, however, it was included in the original information provided to Mass DEP. Kluchman stated this is an area where they have a disagreement with the applicant, as the DEP permit includes both the asphalt plant and the rock crushing and materials processing operation. Since DEP regulated them together staff feels it is appropriate for the Board to regulate them together.

Lewin asked if inclusion of the rock crusher would potentially push the sound level above 75 dBA. Barnes stated it is definitely cumulative and to affect the 75 dBA the ambient would have to be 65 dBA. Deschenes reminded the Board that the court has determined the sound on the site is 75 dBA and the question has always been what can be done to meet the 70 and 53 dBA level.

Hollister asked if the 2009 sound study was theoretical or based on actual ambient sound level measurements, and if there were actual measurements was the rock crushing operation in full use when the measurements were made. Deschenes stated his understanding is that the rock crusher was not included in the ambient measurements. Hollister stated that the applicant wants the Board

to consider this under the MCP criteria, but they do not want them to include the other activities on the site, which they are required to include under this type of special permit, and this causes a disconnect. She asked Barnes to provide an example of what 53 dBA is equivalent to. Barnes stated this is probably twice as loud as suburban daytime sound level.

Galvin asked Silverstein if the Board is confined to the dBA limits established by the judge in his decision. Silverstein stated the judge noted the plaintiff's sound expert estimated a level of 43 dBA at the western boundary and Mr. Barnes did not take issue with that estimate, so the judge noted this information. He stated there is nothing in the judge's decision that says if new evidence comes out regarding ambient noise levels that the Board may not consider that. The judge also did not address one way or another the issue of the crusher. He noted that in the bylaw Table of Uses there is an item for any number of uses, including a line item for Major Commercial Project, and this connotes the project as a whole and you cannot segment various aspects for various uses of the project to avoid regulations.

Green asked by mitigating the west has the problem been pushed the other way. Barnes stated any reflection coming of the wall could be addressed by sound absorption. Green asked if the wall material has been clarified. Barnes stated he has not seen any detail. Green asked what the green piece of equipment was that he observed on the site visit. DeFelice stated that equipment is an additional rock crusher used for different types of material.

Hollister asked how much additional sound protection is afforded by having all the barriers. Barnes stated starting at the property line of 75 dBA, they need a 32 dBA reduction. Barrier walls typically get 20 dBA and that is where the local treatments are needed.

Green opened the meeting to questions from the audience related to sound only.

Wendy Welsh, 11 Edwards Avenue – She stated the applicant indicated they can import crushed rock, however, they are limited on the number of trucks that can come into the site. Green stated this would not change the overall number, but may change operationally where they get materials. Deschenes state the rock crushers on site now are used to process the asphalt, brick, and concrete material that is being brought in, and for crushing the gravel material. The type of stone used to produce asphalt would have to be imported from the quarry next door.

Welsh asked what would happen if the applicant does not meet the sound requirements. Green stated there were measurement criteria related to the permit and if they were not meeting the requirements they would be outside the scope of their approval and would have to make measures to correct that.

Michael McPartland, 14 Danley Drive – He asked if sound radiates over the wall in a radio fashion or as a conductor. Barnes stated the sound comes to the wall and refracts over and around the wall. He asked what is the sound level of the stone crusher. Green stated they do not have that information.

William Stair, 20 Boston Road – He asked if the demand on the rock crusher will increase with the asphalt plant. Deschenes stated the only material they are using from the rock crushing operation will be rap. All other material will be brought onto the site.

Lewin stated that the applicant has asserted many times that they do not currently process crushed stone or sand on the site. He asked should the public take that to mean that the applicant will not crush the kind of stone that would go into the bituminous, or is this a potential operation. Deschenes stated that Mr. DeFelice has indicated they are not going to crush stone on site. He pointed out that the judge also told them that if they were mining their own sand and crushing their own stone on site the production of bituminous concrete would be part of the quarrying operation. Silverstein clarified that the judge stated this is not quarrying. Deschenes stated they have no intention of crushing stone or producing sand.

Alisa Nakashian Holsberg, Betty Lane – She stated at a past meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals Mr. Deschenes specifically stated he did not need the rock crushing permit to put in an asphalt plant, and if he was going to put in an asphalt plant all that activity would be covered under this proposal. She asked which position is correct. Deschenes stated what he said to the Board was they did not need the materials processing special permit in order to build this plant, and if he did not receive those permits he could still have a plant and bring in all that material.

Marie Byrne, 255 Groton Road, N. Chelmsford – She expressed concern with the logistics of the meeting and the size of the meeting room. She asked if the Board is trying to keep people out. Green stated this is not the case, they have made provisions for overflow and will be meeting in a larger facility next week. She stated the people need the opportunity to speak.

Robert Pellegrino, 65 Russell's Lane – He asked if truck traffic was included in the sound model if the applicant has to bring in crushed stone. Deschenes stated he does not believe truck traffic was included in the sound model. Pellegrino asked if it should be included.

Jennifer Noel, Keyes Road – She asked how far one can hear 70 dBA. Mr. Barnes stated it depends on the distance, as well as the background noise level. She asked if the children at the school will be able to hear the process a half mile away. Barnes stated no doubt they would hear this operation, but it would not interfere with speech.

Cory Blumenthal – He asked if the Zoning Board were to grant a variance on the noise level would that absolve the applicant from the court decision. Silverstein stated only if the Planning Board also waives that standard. He explained the bylaw and what the court decision means. Blumenthal asked how much louder a 32 dBA increase would be. Barnes stated a 10 dB increase would be two times as loud, 20 dB would be four times as loud, and 30 dB would be six times as loud. Blumenthal stated although people cannot hear infrasound or ultrasound this does not mean they are not affected by it. He stated he would like to see analysis using frequency bands.

Lewin asked if the Board were to do this type of study could they make a decision based on the findings. Silverstein stated while the Board cannot make a decision on whether they comply with a performance standard on that basis, since this is a discretionary special permit if the Board had

information that some other impact related to noise that is not governed by that performance standard was going to result from the project this could be considered.

Kim L, Groton Road – She asked when the children at the school are silent and they are taking tests will the sound impact them. Green stated the model did not extend out that far.

Jessie Lowe, 8 Nabnasset Street – She expressed concern that the timing of these meetings are not convenient for parents. She stated her daughter has central auditory processing problems and noise would impact her ability to learn, as well as any child with hearing disorders.

Mary Yao, Cobblestone Lane – She asked about the location of the rock crusher. Green stated the rock crusher is on the site, which has one owner and is one company.

Green moved the discussion on to traffic. Kluchman indicated there is no new information related to traffic, this is just an opportunity for questions.

Robert Michaud, of MDM Transportation Consultants, the Board's traffic consultant, addressed the Board and stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Galvin asked what type of mitigation he would recommend regarding the intersection of Groton Road and Commerce Way. Michaud stated he would recommend shoulder hardening, paving and moving the center line of the roadway to the north and widening out portions of the road on the north side to create a hardened shoulder. He asked if there is a possibility for truck traffic, before entering the site, to go beyond the site to do anything else. Mr. DeFelice stated they would make sure to tell their trucks there is no reason to go down there. Kluchman stated the current special permit that was granted by the Board of Appeals includes a condition that requires all commercial truck traffic to enter from the westbound lane.

Hollister asked for clarification of the statement that a truck length is equal to four cars. Michaud stated that is a model that is used and would include the space in between each car. Hollister stated the material from the original application mentioned there would be 24 ton trucks, but in the current hearings they have been discussing 20 ton trucks. DeFelice stated the majority of the trucks would be 24 ton. Michaud stated the difference between the two sizes of trucks is inconsequential.

Green asked about the recommended four feet stabilization on both sides of the road. Michaud stated the area is 24 feet and the suggested dimension is 28 feet, so there would need to be a four foot stabilization. He stated if the stop bar were placed further into the driveway and there were a widening on the north side of the road the swept path of that vehicle would be such that it did not extend beyond the paved surface on the opposite side of the road. Green questioned the capacity to do any improvement in that area. Silverstein stated the Conservation Commission may be receptive to working within the resource area if it is going to improve the environment.

Green asked if there are acceleration profiles or noise profiles available for trucks. He asked if there is a need for further maintenance on that section of the road given the impact of the truck traffic. Green asked DeFelice where on the property the entrance gate is located and what his thought is on vehicle stacking. Deschenes stated the gate is at Route 40 and any vehicle stacking will be inside the gate.

Green asked what work is proposed for the entry road, as there are wetlands on both sides. Kluchman stated the Board has turning radius information from the applicant's engineer, which was modeled on the entrance driveway that was proposed for the self-storage entrance. She stated the plan does show there is a problem with the design so she expects modifications to this design.

Green opened the meeting to the audience for questions on traffic.

Alisa Nakashain, Betty Lane – She provided the Board and applicant a letter. She stated they requested the actual data files for the traffic study and submitted a public record request. However, she found it was not part of the public record so this information cannot be provided. She stated this leads her to believe the traffic consultant has not had access to these data files in order to confirm the modeling that was done by the applicant. She stated at the ZBA meeting they did request the data files and the ZBA did ask the applicant to provide this information and the applicant said no. She stated back in 2009 the applicant was more than happy to provide that data, so they are very disappointed that the applicant will not provide this information. She stated there are concerns about the validity of what is contained in this report.

Nakashian stated they are basing assumptions on the applicant's assertions and making other assumptions that do not seem appropriate. They contacted MassDOT and NMCOG to determine what the speed limit is at the driveway in front of Newport's operation and everybody stated it is posted at 35, however, the limit is 40 m.p.h. Michaud stated regardless of what is posted, the study conducted a speed survey to determine actual ambient travel speeds, and it is on that basis that site line requirements were calculated. In 2009 the speed survey indicated an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of up to 50 m.p.h. along this stretch, and the calculated site line requirements for that design speed were in the vicinity of 500 to 600 feet.

Nakashian expressed concern on the impact of traffic during peak hours. She also expressed concern with bringing increased truck traffic into an area with two failed intersections. She asked if the permit can limit the subcategories of trucks so they are capped at the numbers in the applicant's report. She asked what would be the timeframe to be able to enforce anything on this site.

Hollister asked if Michaud could recommend monitoring methods that have been successful at other locations. Michaud stated monitoring varies depending on the use, the location, and permitting goals and objectives. Some projects conduct traffic monitoring by placing sensors at the entrances and exits. In some instances they do manual observation of turning movements.

Nakashian asked how the Board will enforce what happens with one use versus another use and how it impacts the residents. Kluchman stated that one of Michaud's recommendations would be to establish a baseline truck survey which would cover all the existing uses at the site.

Deschenes stated this site has been in operation for over 100 years and there is truck traffic and activity that has been ongoing throughout that time and is legally operating. He asked why they would want to start limiting what is going on at the site.



Kevin Jansen, 57 Oak Hill Road – He asked if there is an estimate of how many trucks can be handled at the site at one time. DeFelice stated they could accommodate 60 trucks, however, they would not schedule trucks that way. He stated even if this did happen there is plenty of land on the site to stack trucks. Jansen asked what would happen if a truck arrives and pulls over, not knowing what to do. DeFelice stated the operation will be open and there will be signs inside the property pointing trucks to the facility.

Marie Byrne, 255 Groton Road, N. Chelmsford – She stated when the trucks are entering and existing Route 3 there are sharp curves and you can hear the jake brakes. She referenced a complaint she made that was not addressed properly. She stated there were three to five trucks coming every ten minutes, all through the night for three nights in a row. She stated this is a reflection of the site, and the owners of the site, and how they operate the site, as it is all one parcel. She stated she called the town hall and no one ever got back to her. She asked if this is going to happen with the asphalt plant when they have special projects on the highway.

Liz Jani, Fernwood Drive – She asked why this company is investing money in building a facility that can produce double the amount of asphalt allowed by the current proposed stipulations of the Land Court and Town of Westford. She stated this is not financially sound unless they expect to increase the productivity in the future. She expressed concern that their intended plan is to come in the future and say they want to increase the truck trips. DeFelice stated the plant can make 300 ton an hour and if they need 600 ton they only have to run two hours a day, so it makes economic sense. She stated that other asphalt plants in other towns appealed to expand their productivity and Westford should not be blind to that.

Name Inaudible, 70 Russell's Way – He asked why the applicant will not provide the traffic model information. He expressed concern with not including the rock crusher in the sound study, as this may exceed the threshold.

Name Inaudible – She asked what the service time is per truck. DeFelice stated it is approximately 1 to 1.5 minutes to fill a truck, and two trucks can be serviced at once. She asked how long after the truck is filled must the asphalt be used. Green stated the applicant represented an average of two to three hours. Hollister asked what the time would be from when a truck arrives until departure. DeFelice stated if there was no line a truck would be on site approximately ten minutes. The audience member asked how much a truck would hold. DeFelice stated a triaxle would hold 24 tons.

Lewin asked if the PCE takes into account the impact four cars have on a roadway, taking into account acceleration, amount of time it takes to turn, slow down, etc. Michaud stated looking at the time a string of cars would need from the first to last, select a gap, accelerate to the road, follow that car in sequence and accelerate to ambient speed, a truck would have the equivalent of four cars.

Lewin stated in 2009 the only explanation they received at a Board of Appeals meeting was that the traffic data is proprietary private data. He stated it is very confusing where the value is in not providing those electronic files. Deschenes stated they have provided all the data that was used to input and all the data coming out. He stated what is being discussed is the format of the data, which the public wants in electronic format, so they can plug it into their model, which is an unknown

model, and create some report based on the way they want to manipulate the electronic files. Green stated the applicant provided the data five years ago and now it is not being provided. Deschenes stated he does not want to give someone electronic format material so they can manipulate it.

Lewin stated it is the Board's job to call foul if the public manipulates the data, so just as they have concerns that Mr. DeFelice is not on the up-and-up, it does not hold water that the Board are going to be manipulated by somebody else's bogus study. He stated what the applicant is doing by refusing to produce the data in electronic format is actually giving the appearance that they do have something to hide that they did not in 2009. He stated it is confusing to see some of the actions the applicant is engaging in without a good explanation.

Name Not Provided – She asked what will happen if there are wetlands on both sides and it is determined they cannot improve the entrance roadway. Green stated the applicant's engineer is going to clarify information for the Board and they will determine if there is an inherent conflict.

Michaud stated they could do an exercise that indicates it could take five or ten or twelve seconds to accelerate to a certain speed but it is not common to do that., and the variability in vehicle types, the time of day, and the number of trucks would cause one to go in circles. Green stated the data points and the relation to the extent of operations both within and outside the facility is a question for him.

Silverstein clarified that Michaud's opinions in this process have related to operation of the roadway and what a lot of people are discussing is the noise and odors from truck traffic and how that might impact residents in the area. He asked if that is something Michaud is able to comment on. Michaud stated his purview is the operation of traffic on Route 40, and at the driveway, and would not extend to circumstances of other types of impact that may be created.

Green stated they would be looking for information at the next meeting regarding the island and turn analysis that was submitted. Hollister asked about the emergency access road, as well as the access between Fletcher Quarry and their site. Green stated this information is not represented on the plan and asked that this be updated. Hollister stated they need to discuss water resource protection. Kluchman stated the Town Engineer reviewed the project in relation to stormwater and provided a set of potential conditions.

Morrisette requested the public submit all email comments by Wednesday in order to be included in the Board's packet. Kluchman recommended the hearing be continued to Monday, April 13. They have reserved the Blanchard Middle School auditorium, and have also reserved it for Tuesday, April 14 if needed.

Galvin asked what will be the objective that the Board will be voting on. Kluchman stated there are four applications in front of the Board: Stormwater Management Permit, Site Plan Review, Special Permit for Water Resources Protection Overlay District, and a Special Permit for the Major Commercial Permit. Each application would require a separate vote and have a separate decision.

*Motion made by Galvin to continue the hearing until Monday, April 13, 2015, at 7:45 p.m. at the Blanchard School Auditorium, 14 West Street. Motion seconded by Lewin. The motion passed by a 5-0-0 vote.*

*Motion made by Galvin to adjourn. All in favor.*

**List of Documents and Other Items Used at the Meeting**

1. Planning Board Meeting Agenda;
2. DRAFT Planning Board Meeting Agenda for April 13, 2015 meeting;
3. DRAFT Planning Board Meeting Agenda for April 14, 2015 meeting;
4. DRAFT Planning Board Meeting Agenda for April 21, 2015 meeting;
5. Draft Planning Board Meeting Minutes for March 2, 2015 meeting;
6. PB 1515 PRE – 94 Chamberlain Road:
  - a. Memorandum to Jeffrey Morrisette, Town Planner, from Paul Starratt, P.E., Town Engineer, dated April 3, 2015;
  - b. Public Hearing Notice and Posting for 94 Chamberlain Road;
  - c. Letter to the Westford Planning Board from Douglas C. Deschenes, Esq., attorney for the Applicant, dated March 5, 2015;
  - d. Form B – Application for Approval of a Preliminary Plan, dated March 5, 2015;
  - e. Authorization Form for Lauren Baker, Trustee naming Deschenes & Farrell, P.C. to act on her behalf in regards to the Planning Board filing, dated March 3, 2015;
  - f. Unofficial Property Record Card for 94 Chamberlain Road, Westford, MA;
  - g. 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Billing Form signed by Douglas C. Deschenes, Esq.;
  - h. Certified Abutter's Listing, dated February 26, 2015;
  - i. "Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Estates at Baker Glen, Existing Conditions, 94 Chamberlain Road, Westford, MA" prepared by LandTech, dated February 20, 2015;
  - j. "Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Estates at Baker Glen, Conventional Layout, 94 Chamberlain Road, Westford, MA" prepared by LandTech, dated February 20, 2015; and
  - k. "Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Estates at Baker Glen, Construction Waiver Plan, 94 Chamberlain Road, Westford, MA" prepared by LandTech, dated February 20, 2015.
7. Stony Brook 2 – Planning Board Covenants:
  - a. Draft "Stonybrook Phase II Covenant Relative to Roadway and Related Infrastructure.
8. PB 1518 ANR – 6 Durkee Lane:
  - a. E-mail correspondence to Jeffrey Morrisette, Town Planner from Bob Haigh, Bobby's Ranch, dated April 3, 2015.
9. PB 1430 SPR SPMCP SWM – 5 Lyberty Way:
  - a. "5 + 7 Lyberty Way Site Plan, Westford, MA" prepared by LandTech, dated December 19, 2014; revised through March 31, 2015.
10. PB 1429 SPCD SWM SCE – 28 Old Lowell Road:
  - a. "Common Driveway, Site Plan" prepared by LandTech, dated October 8, 2014; revised through April 2, 2015.
11. PB 1509 ADM – PUMA – 10 Lyberty Way:
  - a. Letter to the Westford Planning Board from Jeffrey A. Brem, P.E., on behalf of PUMA, dated March 2, 2015;
  - b. "Recreation Field Plan, PUMA North America.
12. Correspondence:
  - a. E-mail correspondence to the Town of Westford Department Heads from Kaari Tari, Town Clerk, dated March 31, 2015 regarding MassClerks New Open Meeting Law Guide.